

**RFP QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
US ROUTE 15/29 IMPROVEMENTS AT VINT HILL
VDOT PROJECT NO. 0029-030-843
CONTRACT ID NUMBER: C000114713DB105**

February 26, 2019

Revised March ~~7, 2019~~ 15, 2019

RFP PARTS 1, 3, 4 AND 5

1. Due to the high-risk nature of this project. Can the DBE requirement be reduced/eliminated?

VDOT Response: in the DBE goal was revised to be 10% in RFP Addendum No. 2.

2. Can the 3-trainee requirement be eliminated as there will not be enough construction duration to even complete the number of hours required by the trainee program?

VDOT Response: Part 1, Section 11.6 was revised in RFP Addendum No. 2 to state that there will be no requirement for trainees on this Project.

3. In regards to section 4.2.6 of the RFP, can the relevant projects shown on the Lead Designer Work History Form be the experience of the Design Manager or does it need to be that of the Engineering firm serving as the Lead Designer?

VDOT Response: The Lead Designer Work History Form shall contain relevant projects completed by the Lead Designer for this Project as identified in Part 1, Section 4.1.7.

4. Part 4, Article 3.1.2 allows VDOT 21 days to review all submissions and is silent on timeframes for any other review agency, such as FHWA. Given the aggressive schedule requirements, please provide VDOT's commitment to an expedited timeframe, recommended at 7-10 days, for VDOT, FHWA and other agency review periods.

VDOT Response: Review times for submittals, interim design submissions and Construction Documents will be reduced to ten (10) days for submittals requiring VDOT and/or FHWA action. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

5. The DBE goal of 15% is unrealistically high given the scope, schedule and location of the work, and is in contrast to the 11% DBE goal on the nearby Warrenton Southern Interchange Project. Request that VDOT review and adjust this goal to a more realistic 10% goal.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 1.

6. Part 1, Article 11.6 requires an on-the-job trainee goal of 3 individuals. As the duration of construction is likely less than the minimum required duration for most trainee programs, request that VDOT consider eliminating this requirement.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 2.

7. The RFP provides extensive design level information for the Offerors to rely on as the basis for their bid, but does not allow a scope validation process. Should the design builder discover errors or omissions in the information provided, what will be the mechanism for the Offeror to be compensated for error(s) in this information?

VDOT Response: Per RFP Part 1, Section 3.1.1.8, Offerors pre-submittal responsibilities include notifying VDOT in writing of all errors, ambiguities, or discrepancies that are discovered in the RFP Documents. Offerors should exercise the appropriate level of effort required to provide an "all in" price that does not exceed the Maximum Contract Value. Offerors are expected to bid the risk to design and construct the project based on the information provided in the RFP. Scope validation and differing site condition claims will not be considered by the Department.

8. The RFP incorporates the standard design-build CPM Scheduling Specification which requires a Category IV level CPM (Fully Cost & Resource Loaded) Schedule. This is a large and expensive effort that will have little practical value because by the time the schedule is prepared and approved, the project will likely be more than 50% complete. Will VDOT consider reducing the Scheduling requirement to a basic level CPM to define the scope and sequence of activities only?

VDOT Response: The schedule category was reduced to a Category III in RFP Addendum No. 2, eliminating the need for a cost loaded schedule to be prepared.

9. Monthly Billings according to the RFP would be based on 20/80 Billings on the CPM Schedule. Given the short duration of the project and the limited value of a cost loaded CPM Schedule, will VDOT reconsider using the CPM Schedule as the basis for billing and instead utilize a Schedule of Values based on actual percent complete?

VDOT Response: The 20/80 payment process will not be modified for this project.

10. Part 1, Article 6.2.2 indicates that Letter of Submittal Volume I shall include a Proposal Schedule Narrative, and Volume II a Proposal Schedule. However, Part 1, Article 4.0 does not require the Proposal Schedule or Narrative. Further, Part 1, Article 4.4, indicates that the Proposal Schedule and Narrative are due within 3 days of Notice of Intent to Award. Please confirm that the Proposal Schedule and Narrative are not due with the Letter of Submittal and that Part 1, Article 6.2.2 is incorrect.

VDOT Response: The Proposal Schedule and Narrative shall be provided with the Post Notice of Intent to Award submittal and shall not be included with the Letter of Submittal. Part 1, Section 6.2.2 was revised in RFP Addendum No. 2 to reflect this clarification.

11. Request for 48hr extension to submit questions due to receiving addendum #1 less than 24hrs in advance of required question submission date/time.

VDOT Response: Due to the compressed procurement schedule, VDOT will accept RFP-related questions through March 8, 2019.

12. Per VDOT requirements, a level schedule is higher than anticipated based on the project scope, limited review period, functional tool duration, etc. we ask this be reduced to a level 1. RFP Section, 4.4.5, requires quantity and cost loaded schedule.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 8.

GENERAL

13. Verification field offices are not required for this project for any respective parties (VDOT, Design/Build Team, etc.)?

VDOT Response: Confirmed. No field office is required for this Project. Project meetings will be held in the Warrenton Residency.

14. RFP Part 2, Section 1.7, last sentence, “in all cases, the existing projects and their respective contractors shall have priority in scheduling activities and Offerors should take this into consideration in its Price Proposal.” Being that one of these projects is currently already under contract with a design builder who may be pursuing this design build project, we respectfully request this sentence be struck as this is a conflict of interest.

VDOT Response: Part 2, Section 1.7 of the RFP was revised in Addendum No. 2 to omit this sentence.

ROADWAY DESIGN / RFP CONCEPTUAL PLANS

15. What is the maximum allowable grade for the median crossovers?

VDOT Response: Crossover grades shall not exceed 4% and sight distance shall not be reduced with the Design-Builder’s plan. Positive drainage shall be provided. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

16. Article 2.1.3 of Part 2 says that the design-builder is responsible for design exceptions and/or waivers for additional features identified, and also lists several substandard elements of the RFP conceptual design. Please confirm that it is the design-builders responsibility to prepare and submit design exceptions and/or waivers for the sub-standard conditions identified, and that the design-builder can assume the design exceptions and/or waivers will be approved. Please also confirm that the design-builder will not be responsible for eliminating the substandard conditions included in the VDOT conceptual design.

VDOT Response: This is a safety project funded with HSIP fund. Offerors shall refer to IIM-LD-227.11 and the August 28, 2013 Memorandum between FHWA and VDOT regarding exclusion from design exception/design waiver requirements. Offerors shall follow IIM 227,

which requires documentation of substandard features of the design. The Design-Builder will not be responsible for eliminating the substandard conditions included in the VDOT conceptual design.

17. Please confirm the minimum median width of 32 feet is measured from the edge of the thru travel lanes and does not include the turn lanes within the median. While we expect the median paved shoulders are included in the 32' wide median, this is not depicted on the typical sections. Please clarify.

VDOT Response: Confirmed. The minimum median width is measured from the edge of the thru travel lanes. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

18. At the north end of the project, a spline grade has been used from approximately Sta. 135+50 to the intersection with Vint Hill Road. This spline grade does not appear to meet the 50mph vertical design speed. Please confirm that this sag vertical curve does not need to be improved to meet the 50mph design speed, or further improved if a 55mph or 60mph vertical profile is proposed.

VDOT Response: Confirmed. The sag curve prior to the US 29/Vint Hill Rd. intersection is not required to meet the minimum 50 MPH design speed nor is it required to meet the design speed of the two Scope Alternatives. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

19. Please clarify the design speed reduction for the base scope and scope alternatives with regards to designs requirements associated with design speed. Part 2 Article 2.1.3 indicates that the only substandard features associated with design speed are minimum stopping sight distance for vertical curves and vertical grade.

- a. Attachment 2.2 shows minimum ditch slope and width as required for a 50 mph design speed. Is a design waiver required for this reduction? Please also confirm that if the profile is improved to 55 mph or 60 mph, the ditch slopes and widths do not need to be increased or changed.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 16. Additionally, ditches shall be designed to accommodate drainage per the VDOT Drainage Manual.

- b. Attachment 2.2 show the design criteria for the Base Scope. Please confirm that these design criteria also apply if the profile is improved to 55 mph or 60 mph.

VDOT Response: Design criteria indicated in the column entitled "Route 29 NB (60 MPH Horizontal/50 MPH Vertical)-Base Scope" on Attachment 2.2 apply to the Base Scope condition only. With the exception of Minimum Stopping Sight Distance, Crest Vertical Curve k-value, Sag Vertical Curve k-value, and maximum vertical grade, the criteria in Attachment 2.2 are also applicable to Scope Alternative 1 and Scope Alternative 2. Attachment 2.2 was revised in RFP Addendum No. 2.

20. Please confirm that additional intersection sight distance improvements at crossovers are not required, and that the design-builder is not responsible for design waivers or exceptions for intersection sight distance.

VDOT Response: See responses to Question No. 15 and Question No. 16.

21. Part 2 Article 2.2 notes the Design-Builder is also responsible for making improvements to existing median crossovers, existing turn-lanes, and existing driveway connections.
- a. Attachment 2.2 shows a minimum turn lane width of 11'. According to VDOT RDM Appendix F Figure 3-2, turn lane width is the same as the through lane. Is a Design Waiver required for this reduction? If so, who is responsible for this waiver?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 16 and Attachment 2.2. For this project, eleven (11) foot turn lanes are acceptable.

- b. Please clarify the Type of Entrance as shown in RDM Appendix F Table 4-1 for the commercial entrance identified in Attachment 2.2. RFP Conceptual Plans indicates Moderate Volume Commercial Entrance.

VDOT Response: Sheet 2B of the RFP Conceptual Plans indicates the type of entrance treatment (surface) required for each of the 3 entrances. Entrance types are indicated on Attachment 2.2.

- c. Turn Lane Storage and Taper Lengths provided in the RFP Conceptual Plans do not meet the minimum requirements identified in Appendix F Figure 3-1. Please clarify if a design waiver is required.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 16. Additionally, lane storage and taper lengths shall match their respective existing lengths and not be reduced from those indicated on the RFP Conceptual Plans.

22. Attachment 2.2 defines the Design Vehicle for Route 15/29 NB as a WB-67. VDOT RDM Appendix F, Pace F-75 states that medians should be designed to permit U-turn movements and if the median is too narrow to permit U-Turns by the design vehicle, then a flare-out ("loon") as shown in Figure 2-5 should be provided, or else signs shall be erected prohibiting U-turns. With respect to the RFP Conceptual Plans, the crossover and geometry at approximately Sta. 127+50 does not accommodate a Median U-Turn for the Design Vehicle.

- a. Please confirm that the geometry shown with respect to the RFP Conceptual Plans is acceptable and a design waiver is not required.

VDOT Response: Confirmed. The geometry shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans is acceptable. See response to Question No. 16.

- b. Please confirm the design vehicle for the Median U-Turn is a WB-67 and that signs prohibiting U-turns will be required.

VDOT Response: The design vehicle for the Project is a WB-67. However, signs prohibiting trucks from making U-turns shall be incorporated. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

23. Several files which are shown on the RFP conceptual plans were not provided as part of the information package including the existing right-of-way and property line file, property owner file, and the tin from Addendum 1. Please provide these files and confirm they are suitable for use in final design, as there is not adequate time in the schedule to re-do all field surveys.

VDOT Response: An updated RFP Conceptual Plan and all associated electronic files, including the right of way and property lines, property owner and tin, was provided with RFP Addendum No. 2.

24. Please clarify if the design-builder will be responsible for any temporary intersection improvements at the intersection of Riley Road & Broad Run Church Road or at the intersection of Broad Run Church Road and Vint Hill Road.

VDOT Response: VDOT addressed potential improvements to the intersection of Riley Road & Broad Run Church Road and the intersection of Broad Run Church Road and Vint Hill Road in RFP Addendum No. 2.

25. The RFP Conceptual Plans depict re-grading of the inside shoulders for SB US Route 15/29. If re-grading of the existing shoulders and median for SB Route 15/29 is required, please provide design criteria and typical sections for southbound Route 29. If no improvements are required to the southbound shoulders, please confirm a design waiver is not required?

VDOT Response: Median grading shall meet typical grading requirements indicated in the RDM. Also see response to Question No. 16. Grading limits within the existing median have been reduced and are reflected on the RFP Conceptual Plan included with Addendum No. 2. A design waiver is not required for the southbound shoulders.

26. Can VDOT provide the missing MicroStation (*.dgn) files (SBD114713.dgn and SPO114713.dgn)?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 23.

27. Although not shown in the design exhibit (2019-02-03_P029-030-843c501_RFP-Plans.pdf), will the Design-Builder be required to pave all entrances to the existing R/W Line per the RDM Appendix F-90?

VDOT Response: Entrances shall be replaced with the same material as is currently in place. This material shall be placed from the edge of the paved shoulder to the tie-in point of the entrance.

28. If the profiles meeting 55mph or 60mph cause necessary easements to increase, will VDOT still deliver those easements in accordance with the RFP?

VDOT Response: No, the Design-Builder will be responsible for providing a final design that can be contained within the existing RW and proposed TCE which will be acquired by the Department.

29. As shown in the design profiles, there are several vertical sag curves that do not meet the requirements for SSD at 50 mph (Base Scope). Will the Design-Builder be required to lengthen the sag curve to meet SSD for the Base Scope?

- a. Station 112+00 has an SSD of 427'. However, at 50 mph the SSD is required to be 444'.
- b. Station 122+20 has an SSD of 432'. However, at 50 mph the SSD is required to be 457'.
- c. Station 126+65 has an SSD of 429'. However, at 50 mph the SSD is required to be 464'.

VDOT Response: With the exception of the sag vertical curve referenced in Question No. 18, the appropriate k-values found in Attachment 2.2 will be used for these curves. The RFP Conceptual Plans reflect the Base Scope for the Project. Attachment 2.2 was revised in RFP Addendum No. 2.

30. As shown in the design profiles, there are vertical crest curves that do not meet the requirements for SSD at 50 mph (Base Scope). Will the Design-Builder be required to lengthen the sag curve to meet SSD for the Base Scope?

- a. Station 117+25 has an SSD of 428'. However, at 50 mph the SSD is required to be 457'.
- b. Station 132+20 has an SSD of 426'. However, at 50 mph the SSD is required to be 464'.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 29.

31. Will mill and overlay be required in the intersection of Vint Hill Road beyond the limits shown in the 2019-02-03_P029-030-843c501_RFP-Plans.pdf?

VDOT Response: No, mill and overlay will not be required beyond the limits shown in the RFP Conceptual Plans.

32. Can VDOT provide an explanation for the discrepancy between the "2019-02-03_P029-030-843c501_RFP-Plans.pdf" existing profile elevations and the DTM created from the SDT file provided (sdt114713.dgn)? Example: At station 124+00 the DTM shows an elevation of 360.41 and the PDF shows an elevation of 360.13. Similarly, at station 138+50, the DTM

shows an elevation of 385.36 and the PDF shows an elevation of 384.96. Please confirm that the SDT file provided in Addendum 1 is accurate.

VDOT Response: The RFP Conceptual Plans were prepared with the use of an older survey. The revised, updated survey was checked and has a RMSE of blind check points of 0.05 feet and a maximum variance of 0.17 feet. This revised survey and a revised RFP Conceptual Plan were provided in Addendum No. 2.

ENVIRONMENTAL

33. Part 2 Article 2.4.4 mentions wetland delineations (if applicable) are provided for information purposes only. Please provide this information as it was not found in the RFP or Addendum 1 information package.

VDOT Response: All wetlands and streams are located outside of the project footprint and therefore are not applicable.

34. Part 2 Article 2.4.2 states that copies of relevant VDOT/VA SHPO correspondence and mapping showing the location of the historic property are included in the RFP Package. Please provide referenced mapping so that Offerors can determine if additional cultural resource surveys will be warranted.

VDOT Response: A map was included in RFP Addendum No. 2.

35. Article 2.4.6 of Part 2 states that information regarding hazardous materials is included in the RFP Information Package, yet this information was not found. Please provide this information.

VDOT Response: The Hazmat Report was included in RFP Addendum No. 2.

36. Part 2 Article 2.4.4 notes that no permits are required for the Project, with the stipulation that fill is placed only within the existing roadway fill prism. The following statement notes that any changes to the current concept which require fill, permanent or temporary, to be placed “beyond the existing toe-of-slope at any of the existing culvert crossings”, will require a permit and will render this permit determination invalid. Please define the roadway prism and clarify if this applies to the entire project or is only limited to the existing culvert crossings.

VDOT Response: Generally, the roadway prism includes the section of roadway between the existing cut and fill slope tie-in points on the left and right sides of the roadway. For this project, grading activities shall not extend beyond the existing toe of slope of fill slopes along the outside shoulder for the entire Project. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

37. Part 2, Article 1.4 states that the design-builder shall be responsible for evaluating the need to conduct a noise study for any changes from the RFP Conceptual Plans due to their unique design. Please confirm that providing the 55 mph or 60 mph design options are not considered a “unique design” and do not trigger this requirement. If 55 mph or 60 mph

design options do require noise study evaluation, it is not feasible to complete this study within the allowable contract duration.

VDOT Response: This is a Type III project, so a noise study is not required regardless of the design speed. Vertical alignment modifications will not open a new line of sight to any noise sensitive receptors.

38. Part 2, Article 2.4.1 states that changes in scope or project footprint may require additional environmental or technical studies or a change to the NEPA document. Please confirm that providing the 55 mph or 60 mph design options do not trigger this requirement.

VDOT Response: Additional environmental or technical studies will not be required for the design speed options.

39. Part 2, Article 2.4.2 states that the design-builder should consider historic properties a constraint and avoid impacting them beyond what is shown in the RFP Conceptual Plans. Please confirm that providing the 55 mph or 60 mph design options is not considered additional impact.

VDOT Response: see response to Question No. 38.

40. Will the Noise restrictions as defined by Part 5 apply during the shutdown period when 24/7 construction operations are anticipated to be necessary to meet the contract completion milestones/dates?

VDOT Response: No, the DB team shall make all reasonable efforts to plan and execute operations to minimize noise between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. This Project is exempt from local (County) noise restrictions.

GEOTECHNICAL

41. If the Geotech report states that a certain slope is stable is the design build team required to confirm this analysis?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall verify that their design does not result in slope stability factors less than those stated in the Geotechnical Engineering Report using the material parameters and groundwater table location specified in the GER.

42. Part 2 Article 2.6.4 states that the anticipated locations and methods of treatment for unsuitable materials identified in the Geotechnical Engineering Report shall be shown in the design plans and cross sections. Please provide station ranges and associated recommended treatments.

VDOT Response: See Table 9.2 on Page 25 of the GER for a summary of unsuitable materials.

43. Please confirm that the Design-Builder is not required to validate the pavement design identified in Part 2 Article 2.6.1.

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder is not required to validate the minimum pavement section specified in Part 2, Section 2.6.1 of the RFP.

44. Please clarify if existing rock outcrops in the median of US 29 must be removed to improve intersection sight distance, or if they are allowed to remain.

VDOT Response: The existing rock outcrops in the median of US 15/29 between Entrance #1 and approximate Station 120+00 shall be removed.

45. With Addendum 1, a complete geotechnical report was provided. Please confirm that the design-builder does not need to complete any additional geotechnical explorations for either a 50mph, 55mph, or 60mph profile, as there is not sufficient time in the schedule to complete additional field investigations and laboratory testing before construction needs to begin.

VDOT Response: Refer to Part 2, Section 2.6 Geotechnical Work. The Design-Builder is not required to complete any additional geotechnical explorations.

46. RFP Section 2, 2.6.5.1 Blasting Control – Based on current best practices and required federal, state, and local regulations, blasting plans are prepared directly by the blaster, not a blasting consultant. With the minimal area that will require blasting, please strike through the following in the last sentence, “and are not directly involved in the development of the blasting plans”. If not, per what standard and/or guideline will VDOT identify to approve the blasting consultant? Additional cost will be inquired to incorporate this third-party representative. Has VDOT taken this into consideration?

VDOT Response: Additional information regarding the blasting plan and the blasting consultant was provided in RFP Addendum No. 2 and subsequently replaced with RFP Addendum No. 3 in Attachment 2.6.5.

47. RFP Section 2, 2.6.5.2 Test Blast – As noted in question 46 above, please confirm that the “blasting consultant” may be employed by the blasting subcontractor. Also, where is the test blast to be completed?

VDOT Response: Additional information regarding the blasting plan and the blasting consultant was provided in RFP Addendum No. 2 and subsequently replaced with RFP Addendum No. 3 in Attachment 2.6.5.

48. RFP Section 2, 2.6.5.3, control vibrations to less than 0.5 ips. Industry standard is 2.0 ips. Request this be revised to 2.0 ips. If not, this will substantially increase the cost to complete any control of rock blasting. Additionally, hoe ram vibration would be equivalent or greater to a minimum 2.0 ips.

VDOT Response: The requirement as currently stated in the RFP will not be modified. Vibrations from blasting shall not exceed 0.5 inches per second at the nearest structure.

HYDRAULICS

49. Part 2, Article 2.7.2 states that any changes in scope or footprint of the project may require additional hydraulic and stormwater management analysis at the design-builder's cost. Please confirm that providing the 55 mph or 60 mph design options do not trigger this requirement.

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall confirm that the Improvement Factor Waiver remains valid with its design.

50. Part 2, Article 2.7.3 requires a hold-point in the Schedule of 90 days to obtain VPDES permit coverage following submission of the request, which typically occurs during the design phase at approximately 60% level. To meet the July 8, 2019 start of the roadway closure, it would be necessary to submit this request prior to Notice to Proceed. Please provide VDOT's commitment to an expedited timeframe, recommended at 10-14 days, for issuance of coverage that meets the schedule timeframe.

VDOT Response: VDOT is currently working on a plan for an expedited VPDES permitting process. Additional details were provided in RFP Addendum No. 2.

51. Confirm that the 3 culverts that are specifically excluded for replacement will not be required to be recertified, analyzed or confirmed that they are capable of accommodating the additional fill / surcharge loading.

VDOT Response: Replacement of the three (3) existing culverts underneath US 15/29 at approximate Sta. 112+60, approximate Sta. 125+30, and approximate Sta. 136+90 is not part of this project.

52. RFP Section 2, 2.7.3 – SWPPP, paragraph 7 states “it is noted that permit coverage, and subsequent release of work, can take up to ninety (90) days from the time that the design-builder submits a request for coverage that includes all required documents”. Even if the design-build contractor, at their own risk, proceeded in preparing and submitting the application to receive the VSMP permit, at 90 days that would extend beyond the defined schedule/milestone per RFP Section 2.3.1. How will VDOT assist the design-builder in procuring this permit?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 50.

TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

53. Please confirm that all flashing warning signs and mast arm poles within the project limits along NB US 29 may be removed and not replaced with either a 50mph or 55mph vertical profile, both of which are below the full required design speed of 60mph.

VDOT Response: Confirmed. Flashing signs and mast arm poles shall be removed and replacement will not be required regardless of the design speed.

54. Part 2, Article 2.9.1.1 requires the replacement of all signs in the project limits, but conflicts with Article 2.9.1 which states that modifications to existing signs are allowed. Please confirm that if a sign is not impacted by construction, it can remain without replacement. Please also confirm that signs in good condition and meeting current standards can be relocated and not replaced.

VDOT Response: Existing signs that are not impacted by construction and are still applicable with the proposed design may remain in place. Existing signs in good condition and meeting current standards may be relocated. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

55. Part 2, Articles 2.9 and 2.9.2 states that VDOT will be responsible for signal detection, phasing, and timing changes at the intersection of US 29 and Vint Hill Road during the closure period. Please clarify if the design-builder is responsible for signal timing changes at any other signals along US 29 (south of the project limits but north of the US 17 interchange) based on significantly reduces volumes during the detour period, or if VDOT will also take responsibility for these intersections.

VDOT Response: VDOT will be responsible for any required signal timing adjustments on existing signals south of the Project. The Design-Builder shall notify the Culpeper District Traffic Engineer and Northwest Regional Operations at least four (4) weeks prior to the closure for coordination and planning of these adjustments, which will be made by the Department.

56. Part 2, Article 2.9.1.3 states that all ground signs shall be on “interstate” style SSP-VIA or SSP-VA posts. This is inconsistent with VDOT standards for this type of roadway and inconsistent with existing posts. Please confirm that square tube steel posts (STP) are allowable for use.

VDOT Response: Signs may be installed on 2 ½” square tube posts and concrete foundations in accordance with Standards STP-1, Standards SSP-VA structures and foundations or Standards SSP-VIA structures and foundation as appropriate. Signs that require more than two (2) square tube posts will need prior approval by VDOT.

57. Part 2 Article 2.9.3 notes all existing sub-standard guardrail within the Project limits must be upgraded by the Design-Builder to meet current standards per Appendix I of the VDOT Road Design Manual. Per RDM Appendix I, Page I-1 “When the line of rail extends outside the project limits with more than 60% of the existing substandard line of rail within the project limits, the entire run shall be replaced including terminals and upgraded to meet the current Standards.” The RFP Conceptual Plans show guardrail replacement between approximately Sta. 136+75 LT to Sta. 139+25 LT which is more that 60% of the existing run. Please confirm that the remaining guardrail that continues to U.S. 29 SB requires upgrading.

VDOT Response: Confirmed. The radial guardrail on the south side of the intersection of US 15/29 & Vint Hill Road shall be replaced.

58. The RFP Conceptual Plans depict use of the Limited Use Site Preparation Requirements For GR-MGS2 shown on Page 506.08 of the VDOT RBS for all GR-MGS2 terminal locations. Please confirm that this standard can be used for all terminal end treatments on this project.

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder will be required to provide acceptable guardrail site preparation per the VDOT standards. The RFP design meets the requirements for VDOT Standard 506.07 or 506.08.

59. Part 2 Article 2.9.3 states that the Design-Builder shall ensure that the clear zone within the Project limits is free from hazard a fixed objects. This Article later notes that the same clear zone requirements applies to existing conditions affected by this Project where guardrail upgrade is required. Please confirm that the Project limits only include northbound US Route 15/29 and that guardrail upgrades are not required on southbound US Route 15/29.

VDOT Response: With the exception of the radial guardrail on the south side of the intersection of US 15/29 & Vint Hill Road, guardrail upgrades on US 15/29 southbound are not required with this Project.

60. The proposed guardrail terminal shoulder slope treatment at stations 121+00, 134+00 and 137+00 requires a 10:1 slope at a minimum of 6', per Road & Bridge Standards, Section 506.07. Will this be required to be installed by the Design-Builder? If so, will any additional easement or utility impact be the responsibility of the Design-Builder or will this be provided by VDOT?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 58.

61. At station 139+50 left, will the existing guardrail be required to be replaced since it does not meet current standards?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 57.

62. RFP Section 2, 2.9 Traffic Control Devices. “The design-builder shall notify the culpeper district traffic engineer and northwest regional operations at least four (4) weeks prior to the closure for coordination...” Request this be reduced to two (2) weeks.

VDOT Response: The requirement as currently stated in the RFP will not be modified.

63. RFP Section 2, 2.9.2, Signals. “... at least four (4) weeks prior to the closure...” Request this be reduced to two (2) weeks.

VDOT Response: The requirement as currently stated in the RFP will not be modified.

64. RFP Section 2.9.3, Guardrail/Barrier. “Forty-eight (48) hours prior to installation...” Request this be reduced to twenty-four (24) hours.

VDOT Response: Twenty-four (24) hour notice will be acceptable for notice given on Mondays through Thursdays. Forty-eight (48) hour notice will need to be given on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays. This was revised in RFP Addendum No. 2.

65. As noted in the pre-proposal meeting presentation for traffic control, “temporary detour signing will be required outside the project limits for the planned closure and shall be in place at least six (6) weeks in advance of the closure.” Therefore, signs would be required to be installed approx. on May 24, 2019 to maintain the six weeks from scheduled road closure on July 8, 2019. That’s after the TMP plan has been submitted and approved by VDOT. Request this be reduced to two (2) weeks.

VDOT Response: The requirement as currently stated in the RFP will not be modified.

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN / MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC

66. For maintaining access to the existing properties during construction, is it acceptable to only maintain a left hand turn from the south bound lane at the crossovers? This would require north bound traffic to utilize the detour and access the properties from south bound 29.

VDOT Response: This may be acceptable for Entrance #2. VDOT clarified this in RFP Addendum No. 2.

67. Part 2, Article 2.10 states that the design-builder is responsible for traffic and operational analysis for lane closures, roadway reconfigurations, and detours. Given the aggressive schedule requirements, please reconsider this requirement to limit the need for additional analysis only to lane closures and detours beyond what is already allowed by the RFP. An operational analysis per the VDOT Traffic Operations and Safety Manual (TOSAM) is an extremely complicated and time consuming process that appears unnecessary if the design-builder’s lane closures and detours are contained to what is allowed in the RFP allowances.

- a. If an operational analysis of the detour or lane closures is required, please provide all necessary traffic data to complete these analyses (volume, speed, vehicle class), and please clarify if microsimulation tools (VISSIM or SimTraffic) are required. Both data collection and microsimulation are time consuming processes that do not appear warranted for this project’s scope or possible based on the contract timeline.

VDOT Response: This requirement is for any proposed lane/shoulder closures outside of the Culpeper District Allowable Work Hours or outside of the specified US 15/29 northbound closure timeframe.

68. Part 2, Article 2.10.1 discusses additional traffic counts by the design-builder. Please confirm that no additional traffic counts are required if the design-builder adheres to lane closures and detours allowed by the RFP.

VDOT Response: Confirmed. No additional traffic counts will be required if the Design-Builder adheres to the allowable detour route provided in the RFP. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

69. Part 2, Article 2.10.1 states that temporary signal plans shall be submitted to VDOT for review and approval. Please clarify if the design-builder is responsible for a temporary signal plan for the intersection of US 29 and Vint Hill Road during the detour.

VDOT Response: A temporary signal plan for the intersection of US 15/29 and Vint Hill Road is not required with the RFP Conceptual Plan. If the Design-Builder's design requires a temporary signal at the intersection of US 15/29 and Vint Hill Road, the Design-Builder will be required to provide a plan for it.

70. Part 2, Article 2.10.2 states that wrecker service is required on-site 24 hours a day. Please clarify if this applies to the detour period. Please also clarify if “on-site” requires the wrecker to physically be on-site at the closure, or if wrecker service is required for coverage of the entire detour length, or if it can be on-call. On-site wrecker service will be a significant additional cost if it required to be on-site full-time, especially if the limits of the “site” include the entire detour route.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 88.

71. The detour route exhibit included in the RFP documents includes detour signs, yet these signs appear to be missing required information such as US 15 & 29 shields, required warning signs along US 15/29 NB prior to Riley Rd, and required detour signs along US 29 for traffic originating in New Baltimore. Please confirm that this is simply a concept, and that the design-builder is responsible for full required signing per the Virginia Work Area Protection Manual. It is anticipated that 5 to 10 times the quantity of signs shown on this plan may actually be required.

VDOT Response: The detour exhibit provided was for information only and was simply a conceptual exhibit to illustrate the desired path of the detour, and is not indicative of a signing plan. The Design-Builder is required to provide a complete detour signing plan and for installation of the required signing. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

72. Please clarify if the hourly user fees prescribed in Article 2.10.4 of Part 2 of the RFP are applied in addition to the prescribed liquidated damages if the NB US 29 closure period exceeds 26 days.

VDOT Response: Damage recovery/user fees for lane closures only apply to lane closures along US Route 15/29 once the detour has been removed. Liquidated Damages, as defined by

Exhibit I to Part 3, will be assessed if Route 15/29 is not open to the public by the Interim Completion Date of August 2, 2019.

73. **Part 2, Section 2.10.4 Damage Recovery:** Please confirm that the damage recovery/user fees for lane closures only apply to lane closures along Route 15/29 once the detour has been removed. Furthermore, please confirm that if Route 15/29 is not open to the public by the Interim Completion Date of August 2, 2019, that only the Liquidated Damages as defined by Exhibit I to Part 3, Section 5.5.2 will be assessed. In other words, utilizing the detour beyond August 2, 2019 will not be assessed Liquidated Damages and Damage Recovery fees, combined.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 72.

74. What are lane closure hour restrictions for this project?

VDOT Response: Culpeper District Allowable Work Hours were included in the RFP Information Package.

75. What are the night and weekend work restrictions for this project beyond the shutdown period?

VDOT Response: See responses to Questions No. 72, Question No. 74 and Question No. 98.

76. With the aggressive schedule and unpredictable weather in '18, how does VDOT anticipate to address inclement weather impacts during the shutdown period?

VDOT Response: Per RFP Part 4, Article 8.2.1, "It is specifically understood that other than floods in excess of the base flood, hurricane force winds and tornados, Design-Builder assumes the risk, and will not be entitled a time extension for any delays caused by weather or conditions resulting from weather." Also, per Attachment to Part 3, Article 5 (Provision for "No Excuses Incentives"), dates shall not be subject to any adjustment for any reason, including but not limited to those events identified under Section 8.2.1 of the General Conditions of Contract that would entitle Design-Builder to an extension of the Contract Times.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

77. Please confirm that VDOT will be responsible for the public outreach campaign with media, newspapers, and the general public.

VDOT Response: VDOT will be responsible for public outreach, however, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for coordinating with the Department on the preparation and release of information to the public as noted in Part 2, Section 2.11 of the RFP.

78. Please clarify if VDOT will require the design-builder to hold "pardon our dust" meeting(s) prior to construction and/or the detour.

VDOT Response: Yes, the Design-Builder shall be responsible for holding informal meetings, which includes “pardon our dust” meetings prior to construction activities. This was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 2.

RIGHT OF WAY

79. Is there better existing ROW information available (CAD files)?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 23. A revised right of way file was provided in RFP Addendum No. 2.

80. Will VDOT be obtaining a temporary easement from the Battlefield Baptist Church for the purpose of driveway reconstruction?

VDOT Response: No, the RFP Conceptual Plans do not require a temporary construction easement on the church property.

81. According to Fauquier County, it appears parcel 001 is served by well and septic. Please confirm that if work is contained within the existing right-of-way along the frontage of Parcel 001 and within the limits of the temporary construction easement, there will be no impacts to the septic and/or well and that the design-builder is not responsible for any additional investigations or replacement well or septic improvements.

VDOT Response: Confirmed. The Design-Builders final design shall be within the existing right of way limits as shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans, including the temporary construction easement indicated on Parcel 001. As such, no impacts to the existing well or septic on Parcel 001 are anticipated.

82. Part 2, Article 1.5 of Addendum 1 indicates that VDOT is acquiring the temporary easement necessary on Parcel 001, but that VDOT is not responsible for any delays associated with the acquisition of that easement. Please clarify what role the design-builder has in the event the easement is not obtained before the shut-down period begins, and what obligation the design-builder has to maintain the existing driveway should the easement not be available to make permanent driveway improvements during the contract schedule.

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall assume that the TCE as indicated on the RFP Conceptual Plans will be acquired prior to the closure period.

83. Due to the proximity of the cut and fill, can VDOT provide the drain field information for the single-family homes at stations 132+00 and 135+00 right?

VDOT Response: Well and septic drain field locations are indicated on the revised survey mapping, which were provided in RFP Addendum No. 2.

84. RFP Part 2, Section 1.5, paragraph 3, VDOT has struck through this sentence as follows, “All right of way acquisition costs (compensation paid to landowners for right of way or permanent easement) will be paid by VDOT, and shall not be included in the Offeror’s Price Proposal.” Paragraph 5 states “VDOT will begin acquiring the right-of-way...” Furthermore, it states in this paragraph that Entrance 3 “should be assumed to be acquired by VDOT and costs associated with this acquisition should not be included in the Offeror’s Price Proposal”. There are only 3 entrances of which two are identified in this section. If VDOT is taking the lead to acquire the required ROW, then the design-builder should not be held accountable for any acquisition costs. Request 2nd sentence in paragraph 3 be reinstated.

VDOT Response: VDOT will acquire and pay for the temporary construction easement that is known to be required for Entrance #3. Per RFP Section 1.5, acquisition of any easements or right-of-way that deviate from those shown on the RFP Conceptual Plans for the project will be at the sole risk of the Design-Builder to include all cost and time impacts associated with attaining those easements in accordance with Part 2 Section 2.12 of the RFP.

UTILITIES

85. Based on the estimated depth of the newly discovered Comcast cables under NB US 29 near Sta. 120+00, it appears these cables may be in conflict with the proposed improvements. Please clarify if VDOT’s conceptual plans are in conflict with these cables, and what the design-builder’s responsibility is for any conflict.

VDOT Response: The Comcast utilities are considered to be in conflict with the proposed Project. The Department has met with Comcast and is considering holding a UFI meeting ahead of project Award to facilitate utility coordination. However, this shall not relieve the Design-Builder of the responsibility to coordinate and perform utility relocations based on their unique design.

86. As discussed during the Pre-Proposal meeting, “dark fiber” may be located within the project limits and could be impacted by the Project. As these utilities are not marked and their location is not known by the design-builder pre-bid, how will these unknown utilities be handled should they be discovered to be in conflict after Award?

VDOT Response: The updated survey files list all known utility owners. Offerors are encouraged to contact these Owners for additional information. The updated survey files ~~was-were~~ provided in RFP Addendum No. 2. The Design-Builder is responsible for all utility coordination.

87. What level of coordination and commitment has the department received from each of the utility owners? With the extremely compressed schedule and design approvals likely to not be complete until day’s prior to start of construction, it is imperative that the utility owners are committed to expedited relocations. In addition, the utility owners will have a direct impact on the Offeror’s ability to achieve the on time reopening of Rt 29 NB. Should the utility be the reason that the Offeror is unable to complete work on time, will the Offeror have any relief from the disincentive and liquidated damages?

VDOT Response: In accordance with RFP Part 2, Section 2.13, Offerors are responsible for contacting known utilities within the project corridor during the procurement and shall bid the risk accordingly. Offerors will not have any relief for failure to complete work on time.

Additional Questions Received March 6, 2019

88. VDOT's response to Question 70 posted 2/26/19, referenced "Wrecker service covering the entire detour length shall be available 24 hours a day either by providing a wrecker on-site, or through an "on-call" service and must provide a response time of less than 15 minutes." Please provide clarification for the following questions:
- a. "Wrecker service covering the entire detour length". If there is an accident on Rt.17 or I-66, how will VDOT and the design-builder know if this is a result of the detour and what will be the process to determine who is responsible for the wreck? Also, if there is any accident along the detour, the design-builder is responsible to pay to transport the vehicle to a designated location? As noted in the RFP Section 2.10.2, "The wrecker shall be on site 24 hours a day whenever a long-term stationary work zone is in place..." This sentence defines "work zone" and "within the Project limits", not detour. It appears the response to this question posted 2/26/19 is a scope change and therefore cost increase. Please provide verification that VDOT has included this level of scope and cost within their cost analysis and will not exceed the maximum contract value of \$3.5M?
 - b. 15 minute response time is not practical. Based on the conceptual detour plan, it will take a vehicle longer than 15 minutes just to drive the detour route. If VDOT will uphold the 15 minute requirement, how many wreckers will be required to be on-site and provide the designated staging areas? Also, please strike through the "on call" service response, because it is not realistic that a wrecker service can respond in 15 minutes. Where will the trucks be staged at during the project?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder will not be required to provide wrecker service for this project. VDOT will be responsible for providing wrecker service. This ~~will be~~ was clarified in RFP Addendum No. 3.

89. Part 2, Section 2.10.2 states, "... and shall drop the disabled vehicles at the Design-Builder's designated storage location within the Project Limits." The project limits are along Rte.29 between Riley Rd and Vint Hill. So does this mean that if there is an accident on I-66, the design-builder is required to transport the vehicle back to the Rt.29 (within the project limits)?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 88.

90. Part 2, Section 2.10.2 states, "A medium duty wrecker..." Please provide the specifications for a medium duty wrecker (ie. Weight restriction, etc.). What are the expectations of the equipment? Some existing contracts with VDOT require the wrecker service to just clear the roadway, and a county dispatched wrecker will recover the vehicle during a designated time, is this an option? The medium wrecker is defined as a single axle or tandem? Define capabilities of the truck you are

requiring. Are we allowed to call additional trucks to help that aren't on the contract if there is a need for them? Who pays for the extra wreckers? How many wreckers are needed for the contract?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 88.

91. The state police and county requirement to arrive on scene to clear the road way is 30 minutes for a light duty call, and 45 minutes for a large wrecker, such as a rotator. Decreasing the time frame will raise to risk for accidents, and the safety of the motoring public. Please confirm the response time can be revised to 30 minutes.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 88.

92. Are there any requirements for the operator and/or wrecker service to have minimum prerequisite experience or training? Current VDOT contracts state at least 5 years of towing and recovery experience.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 88.

93. The RFP states to tow the vehicle to a storage lot in the scope of the work zone, but for example, if the car wrecks at I-66 and Rte. 29 and is towed by the wrecker service to the staging area and then the customer wants the vehicle to go to a different location/shop, is the wrecker service required to call a wrecker not on the contract and tow the vehicle to a facility for a charge to the customer?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 88.

94. What if the wrecker service arrives on scene and the Virginia State Police have called for a different wrecker service, but the road is blocked. Does the wrecker service wait for the requested wrecker or do they remove the vehicle from the road way per the contract with VDOT?

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 88.

95. Addendum No.2 included Special Provision for Controlled Blasting, May 2014. Under Section II of this SP, it states “refer to VDOT Special Provisions for pre-blast inspection and test blast program.” Not included in Addendum No.2. Please provide.

VDOT Response: Requirements for pre-blast inspection and test blast program ~~will be~~ clarified in RFP Addendum No. 3 by removing this Special Provision and replacing it with Attachment 2.6.5.

96. Addendum No. 2, SP for Controlled Blasting, May 2014, Section III, first paragraph, identified “No blasting shall be performed within fifty feet of existing....” What is the required distance not to blast for existing storm drainage and box culverts?

VDOT Response: Existing storm drainage and box culverts are considered to be “other structures”, so no blasting shall be performed within fifty feet of existing storm drainage and box culverts. The SP for Controlled Blasting was replaced with Attachment 2.6.5 in RFP Addendum No. 3.

97. Addendum No.2, SP for Controlled blasting, May 2013, Section III, third paragraph, states “The attachments to this special provision convey forms for completing the blasting plan and blasthole drilling log.” Please provide.

VDOT Response: These attachments ~~will be~~ provided in the RFP Addendum No. 3 by removing the Special Provision and replacing it with Attachment 2.6.5 Information Package.

98. To blast, State Fire Marshall requires roads must be shut down during days because of safety issues, VDOT technical requirements, typically, just allow it during nights because of traffic. Please confirm if Rt. 29 SB can be shut down during the day or night to blast? What are the allowable blasting time of day restrictions? How long can Rte.29 SB traffic be temporarily stopped to blast? Are there any additional restrictions/requirements to blast rock?

VDOT Response: Blasting operations may be only be conducted between 6:30 am and 11:00 am Monday through Friday. Blasting operations will not be allowed at nights or on weekends. Temporary traffic stoppages on Route 29 SB shall be limited to 15 minutes for blasting. A minimum 48 hour notification to the public via PCMS will be required prior to all scheduled blasting operations.

99. RFP, Part 1, Section 4.1.3, states “... Price Proposal will remain in full force and effect for one hundred twenty (120) days after the date the Price Proposal is submitted..” How will VDOT address the pricing if the NEPA is not obtained prior to proposal submission date?

VDOT Response: FHWA approved the NEPA document for public availability on 02-27-2019. Per RFP Part 1, Section, 2.4, the NEPA process is anticipated to be complete prior to the scheduled date for project award.

100. VDOT’s response to Question 85 posted 2/26/19, referenced “The Department has met with Comcast and is considering holding a UFI meeting ahead of project Award to facilitate utility coordination.” Will this meeting take place prior to project Award and if so please identify date/time/etc.?

VDOT Response: The date of this meeting has not been set, but it is anticipated to take place prior to Project Award. The Successful Offeror receiving the Notice of Intent to Award will be invited to this meeting.

Additional Questions Received March 14, 2019

101. Addendum #3, Attachment 2.6.5 – Controlled Blasting, Section II Pre-Blasting Procedures, subsection Pre-Blast Inspection, second paragraph, states “A licensed professional structural engineer...” and third paragraph, states “A certified land surveyor...”. This is a substantial change to the RFP and will require the design-builder to incur additional cost and will affect the time prior to start of blasting. This scope of work is above normal standard practices in accordance with Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code (SFPC). Please clarify where this is a requirement in accordance with SFPC? Please provide verification that VDOT has included this level of scope and cost within their cost analysis and will not exceed the now maximum contract value of \$3.6M?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall meet the requirements set forth in Attachment 2.6.5.

102. Addendum #3, Attachment 2.6.5 – Controlled Blasting, Section II Pre-Blasting Procedures, subsection Pre-Blast Inspection, third paragraph, states “A plan of this system shall be submitted to the Engineer for review and comments.” Please identify the maximum review duration?

VDOT Response: See response to Question #4.

103. Addendum #3, Attachment 2.6.5 – Controlled Blasting, Section II Pre-Blasting Procedures, subsection Test Blast Program, paragraph one, states “Prior to any production blasting, the Design-Builder shall perform a test blast program.” This is a substantial change to the RFP and will require the design-builder to incur additional costs and will affect the time prior to the start of blasting. Please provide verification that VDOT has included this level of scope and cost within their cost analysis and will not exceed the now maximum contract value of \$3.6M?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall meet the requirements set forth in Attachment 2.6.5.

104. Addendum #3, Attachment 2.6.5 – Controlled Blasting, Section II Pre-Blasting Procedures, subsection Test Blast Program, paragraph two, states “Submit the test blast design one week prior to execution.”, then paragraph six, states “Submit the conclusions of the test blast to the Engineer at least three days prior to production blasting.” Being that this section of the specification states the test blast program is to be conducted “in the same rock formation”, and the time restraints for the entire project, is the “test blast program” a requirement to comply with Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code or a request by VDOT and can this program be eliminated? If the test blast program is required, please confirm this can be completed at the site prior to the 26 day shutdown period?

VDOT Response: The test blast design and conclusions of the test blast may be submitted sooner than the times specified in Attachment 2.6.5. The test blast should be considered to be the first of planned production blasts and will only be allowed during the northbound closure period.

105. Addendum #3, Attachment 2.6.5 – Controlled Blasting, Section III Blasting Procedures, paragraph one, states “No blasting shall be performed within fifty feet of existing or new bridge foundations, railroad right-of-way, residential or commercial buildings, wells or other structures (including storm drainage and culverts)...”. RFP dated February 9, 2019, Special Provision SP107-DB1110-00 dated December 19, 2018, Section II Blasting Procedures, states “No blasting shall be performed within 100 feet of existing or new bridge foundations...”. This is a substantial change. Please confirm this can be revised to the 100 feet requirement. If not, please provide verification that VDOT has included this level of scope and cost within their cost analysis and will not exceed the now maximum contract value of \$3.6M?

VDOT Response: The Design-Builder shall meet the requirements set forth in Attachment 2.6.5.

106. Addendum #3, Attachment 2.6.5 – Controlled Blasting, Section III Blasting Procedures, paragraph seven through nine, reference production blasthole requirements. The cartridge diameter is too restrictive for standard industry performance. This specification appears to be referring to pre-split blasting and not production blasting in a grid pattern. Typical practice does not use any product smaller than 2-inch in any cut depth for production blasting. Please confirm this can be revised to minimum 2-inch diameter?

VDOT Response: Refer to “Rock Blasting and Overbreak Control,” by Calvin Konya, Section 6.6 and submit calculations accordingly for review by VDOT. (Attachment 2.6.5 is not specific to pre-splitting.)

107. Addendum #3, Attachment 2.6.5 – Controlled Blasting, Section III Blasting Procedures, paragraph two, states “.. ground motion to exceed 0.50 inches per second...”. Typical practices are 2.0 inches per second. Please confirm this can be revised to 2.0 inches per second?

VDOT Response: See answer to Question No. 48..

108. Addendum #3, Attachment 2.6.5 – Controlled Blasting, Section V Explosives, references ANFO and bulk emulsion blasting agents. Can these be used or is the design-builder restricted to cartridge product?

VDOT Response: We are not limiting the type of explosive. We are requiring a blast plan submittal that will indicate that the intended plan will comply with Attachment 2.6.5.

109. Should the project construction require the relocation of any existing utility facility and it is determined that the relocation is a project cost, then VDOT will reimburse the utility owner for the actual utility relocation cost that is a project expense? The Design-Builder shall be responsible for cost of providing utility relocation coordination services in accordance with the technical requirements.

VDOT Response: See response to Question No. 87.